



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

extremely rare. Otherwise, one might think that *endemes* was shortened from \**emn-dêmes*, although the meaning of this latter compound does not seem to answer so well as that of the supposed \**êndêmes*.

E. SIEVERS.

Tuebingen, Febr. 16, 1886.

### SUUM CUIQUE.

The stress which Prof. Sievers has himself laid upon the phonological difficulties in the way of his alternative etymologies of *endemes* is perhaps sufficient to warn against a too hasty conclusion. On the other hand Prof. Sievers has, as it seems to me, in failing to adopt the more natural course, understated the probabilities in favor of his own theory. If the suggested derivation of the Old Norse compounds *endemi* and *ædæmi* be correct, as I think it is, we cannot escape the necessity of allowing for the Old Norse a special growth in the signification of these words as well as in that of the simple *dæmi*, 'example,' in which the Anglo-Saxon had no share. There is some violence in assuming that a word should develop from an application which is restricted to an individual of a class, a meaning which afterwards becomes applicable to all except the individual. It is far better, in the present instance, to have regard to the more original and general meaning of *dæmi*, 'judgment, sentence,' then 'fate' as in *hœrð dæmi* 'a hard fate,' and to attribute to Anglo-Saxon the further natural adverbial use *en-demes* or *emn-demes* 'by one and the same fate, under like conditions, in like manner,' and in a temporal sense, 'simultaneously.' This view, moreover, should modify Prof. Sievers' closing statement in which a preference for *en-* (= *ân-*) as the first element of the compound is acknowledged, and throw the presumption in favor of *emn-*.

It will be seen that the foregoing considerations constitute a double necessity for restricting the formation and use of *endemes* to the Anglo-Saxon. If then this compound was made upon Anglo-Saxon ground, we should expect to find the independent use, as *simplex*, of the second element; and I think it may be shown to exist.

In the preparation of my former contribution on *endemes* I rejected two theories which had

at first occurred to me, in favor of that to which I then gave my preference. The first of these was that which, after publication, I found lurking behind a query in Cosijn's *Altwestsächs. Gram.* §80, namely, "*emndênes simul facto.*" In my second attempt I had tried to bring *-denes* into relation with *dóm*, *déman* but finally desisted, because it then seemed to me to require the assumption of a word which was not known to exist in the language. Prof. Hart afterwards privately communicated the same theory, and in the following words refused to consider my objections to it as valid: "Not only have we the verb *déman* and the noun *déma*, but the noun *dém(m)* masc. exists parallel with *dóm* (cf. Past. 31, 20. 87, 1. 379, 9; Oros. 72, 11. 92, 19. 270, 2; *dannu* = *demme*, E. Stud. IX 37<sup>a</sup>, 25). Why need we hesitate to treat *-dênes* as the genitive of *dém* = adv., and the compound as analogous to *æquanimis*, *æquanimus*, *æquanimo*? The only objection is the non-gemination of the *m*. But in compounds (especially if accented as \**êfn-dém-*) we need not expect rigid orthography."

It is clear from such an example as Past. 31, 20, where *se si ðemesða demm* of the Hatt. MS. stands parallel to *se siðemesta dom* of the Cott. MS., that *demm* and *dém* were once close synonyms. The development of the meaning of *demm* was therefore from 'judgment, sentence,' to 'fate,' especially 'hard fate,' then to 'calamity, injury, disgrace,' in general. In the passage: "*Ne wen þu no þæt ic to anwille winne wið ða wyrd, forþam ic hit no self nauht ne ondræde, forþam hit oft gebyrað þæt seo lease wyrd nauper ne mæg þam men don ne fultum ne eac nænne dem* (Boeth. Fox. 70, 20-23), *demm* is brought into a relation with *wyrd* that may illustrate the middle term in the series of its meanings.

The difficulty of obtaining an ungeminated form of the gen. sg. of *demm* could perhaps be removed by assuming the stem \**démio-* which would originally be inflected like *ende*, but might afterwards be attracted to the larger class of short stems with gemination. That the association of a geminated consonant with a long stem-vowel was possible early in the language, would seem to be shown in *hýse hýsses hýssas*, etc., where the gemination persists after the act of compensative lengthening (cf. Kuhn's Zeits. XXVI, p. 86).

In this manner the derivation offered by Prof. Sievers, and as above modified, may be defended. The argument from the metre rests upon a basis that is as yet too hypothetical to draw from it any certain conclusions of the character here required.

I now turn from this theory which will no doubt find some favor, to confess that I am not yet prepared to relinquish my former position. The development of a mute after a nasal is exhibited in every period of the language. It is accepted for *endleofan* 'eleven' (cf. *enleſta* Oros. 288, 25), and is shown to be a live process in historic Anglo-Saxon times by the changes which the foreign *uncia* undergoes in becoming *yndse*, *yntse*, etc., (Oros. 196, 21 *uncias* is rendered by *yndsān*, with change in number as required by the native idiom), to say nothing of such other instances as are indicated by Prof. Sievers in his Grammar §198, 5, note 2. In the light of this fact and of the remarkable coincidence, as I take it, furnished by the Middle English *anende*, *anendes* *anendest*, etc., which we know to have developed from the phrase *on emn*, I prefer to see in the genesis of *endemēs* an operation of the same law. At this point Prof. Sievers offers an objection to which I cannot assent. If we are to accept the influence of the Old Norse *jamt*, *jafnt*, what shall be said of the Middle High German *neben* *nebent*? The divergent forms in Middle English (e. g. *anentes*, *anemptes*) in which the dental and the labial nasal interchange with the corresponding variation in the following mute, show conclusively that we have here a purely phonetic process. In a matter so simple and so natural one must be surprised at the hesitating and even contradictory statements made under *anent* in the Philological Society's new Dictionary. We may also be justified in pressing this analogy still farther. The fashion of the scribe of the Lauderdale MS. of the Orosius to use the labial dental forms (86, 15. 138, 6. 192, 29) has the appearance of a like individual or dialectal preference to that which we have observed in Middle English; the development in Anglo-Saxon did not, of course, go so far as to modify the following mute, but the *m* in each case, points to *emn* and not to *en* (< *an*).

Finally, I do not consider an early attraction of an adverb in the superlative *-mest* to the

prevailing adverbs in the genitive *-es*, in the least degree improbable.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

#### THE ACADEMIC STUDY OF GÆTHER'S FAUST.

Mr. W. L. Courtney, writing in the *Fortnightly Review* for January concerning Mr. Irving's recent presentations of *Faust* at the Lyceum Theater in London, quotes this remark of Coleridge: "There is no whole in the poem; the scenes are mere magic-lantern pictures and a large part of the work is to me very flat." The words are from the *Table Talk* of Feb. 16, 1833. The completion of *Faust* had appeared the preceding year but Coleridge had doubtless not heard of it. Probably he would not at that date have taken the trouble to read far in it if it had fallen into his hands. But the essayist of the *Fortnightly* goes on to observe upon his own account: "In Gæthe's *Faust* there is, in point of fact, no unity, no ground plan - - - but a series of pictures in which, faithful to the traditions of the old puppet shows - - - the author transcribes a variety of brilliant scenes and a series of brilliant dialogues between the tempter and the tempted." So far as I have been able to discover, English criticism of *Faust* has not in the main, got much beyond this wisdom of Coleridge as expounded approvingly by Mr. Courtney. It has not found out that Gæthe completed his drama and that the completion counts. In spite of isolated voices to the contrary, the opinion seems to be still dominant in England that the Second Part of *Faust* is not to be taken seriously, but is to be regarded only as a curious delirium of Gæthe's old age, containing little else than evidence on a grand scale of the final decadence of its author's poetic faculty.

To what extent does this same opinion, now for some time obsolescent in Germany, prevail in our own country? In 1871 Bayard Taylor wrote in the introduction to the second volume of his translation: "I know how much prepossession I encounter in claiming for the Second Part of *Faust* a higher intellectual, if a lower dramatic and poetical value, than the First Part." (*sic*). To my own mind this was